

REMARKS

Claims 1-62 are in the application. Claims 1-62 were rejected primarily in view of Fallside, either alone or combined with Xu and a number of other references.

Applicant has amended certain of the claims to address certain informalities that were noted, which Applicant submits should address the Section 112 matters noted by the Examiner. Applicant thanks the Examiner for the careful review of the claims that resulted in the identification of certain of these informalities which are corrected herein.

While Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections in view of Fallside (whether alone or in combination with Xu or the other references), Applicant has chosen to clarify the claims to emphasize certain fundamental distinctions over the cited references. As all rejections were premised on an analysis of the Fallside reference, Applicant submits that, for at least the reasons set forth below, Fallside is readily distinguishable from the invention defined by the presently pending claims, whether or not combined with the other references, and all claims should be allowable.

Fallside is directed to an FPGA-based Communications Access Point and System for Reconfiguration. Fallside does not, however, suggest or describe the elements of the presently pending claims. For example, Fallside does not describe a method for updating the configuration of a programmable logic device-based packet filtering system operating to provide packet filtering in a packet-based network based on source/destination address information and first configuration data, selectively receiving second configuration data (which preferably is based on version identification information for the PLD system), and after loading of the second configuration data operating the system to provide packet filtering based on source/destination address information and the second configuration data. Thus, in accordance with Applicant's invention, a PLD-based packet filtering function is provided that is based on source/destination address information (and thus may be considered stateful-type filtering), whereby configuration data for the PLD may be updated with packet filtering thereafter being performed based on the updated configuration data. Such upgradeable, packet filtering functionality provided via a PLD is neither disclosed in, nor suggested by, the cited references.

While other references such as Xu discuss network filtering (such as for ATM environments), none of the references alone or in combination disclose or suggest a PLD-based, stateful/address-based network filtering device, where configuration data for the network filtering device can be changed in order to upgrade or change the behavior of the network filtering device. Accordingly, Applicant submits that Fallside is readily distinguishable from the claimed invention, whether considered alone or in combination with the other references. Applicant further notes that the dependent features also recite subject matter that further distinguishes the claimed invention from the cited references.

Finally, Applicant notes that it is still reviewing whether or not Fallside is in fact prior art to Applicant's invention. While Applicant does not admit that Fallside is in fact prior art to Applicant's invention, and Applicant may demonstrate in the future that Applicant's invention predates Fallside, Applicant has chosen herein to emphasize the clear distinction of the claimed invention over the Fallside reference.

Reconsideration and allowance is requested.

Please charge any additional fees due, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 50-0251.

No new matter has been added.

Respectfully submitted,



Alan R. Loudermilk
Registration No. 32,788
Attorney for Applicant(s)

February 6, 2005
Loudermilk & Associates
P.O. Box 3607
Los Altos, CA 94024-0607
408-868-1516